Dating Chronicles and the Purpose of Chronicles[1]

by Jonathan Dyck

Introduction

The problem of the date of Chronicles has not attracted the sort of attention that perhaps the dating of the Pentateuch has done. The relative dating of Chronicles vis-à-vis the Pentateuch and Samuel-Kings was established early on in modern research and its comparative lateness continues to be an assured result of criticism.

The absolute dating of Chronicles begins well in that the upper and lower limits for the period of time within which the book as a whole had to have been written are well established and relatively uncontroversial, but this "hard" evidence leaves us with a considerable scope of time, roughly two hundred years. I cannot now report any recent progress in this regard for no new evidence is at hand. What I want to do in this paper is to explore the relationship between the dating of Chronicles and the reconstruction of the Chronicler's purpose.

All attempts to be more specific about the date of Chronicles hinge on the relative plausibility of their respective hypotheses regarding purpose. One could even go so far as to say that there is no debate about dating; the debate is about purpose and attendant occasion. What interests me is the way scholars construe purpose, specifically the relationship between purpose and setting. The argument to be developed here is that inadequate concepts of purpose have led us down dead ends in terms of dating Chronicles. The proposal of this paper is thus in the first instance a negative one, namely that it is more difficult to establish purpose and, from that, occasion, than has hitherto been recognized, because purpose is a more complex notion than it may appear. On the positive side what I am arguing is that a better understanding of purpose allows us to continue to explore the relationship between life and literature without falling into the trap of pursuing more chronological precision for very little gain.

Relative and Absolute Indicators of Date

Before moving on to the issue of the relationship between purpose and date, let us review briefly the evidence as we have it for the relative and absolute date of Chronicles. The relative date of Chronicles in the context of the Old Testament was the interest of the first generations of critical scholars. Following Wilhelm de Wette it is still generally agreed that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his main source and hence post-dates those books.[2] Besides Samuel-Kings it can be demonstrated that the Chronicler used parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua. This is most obvious in the genealogies where the lists of names and places, beginning with Adam and extending out from him to all the nations of the world and from Israel (Jacob) to "all Israel," are derived from lists found in Genesis, Numbers, and Joshua. The Chronicler also presupposes Pentateuchal (Priestly and Deuteronomic) legislation in his historical treatment of the cult,[3] though he does exercise a degree of independence in ascribing cultic legislation to David (as it relates to the Levites in particular).

Chronicles, thus, post-dates both the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History; in other words, Chronicles is post-exilic. The date assigned to Chronicles, relative or absolute, also depends on one's view of the composition history of the book. If one does not assume the unity of the work as it stands, the whole dating procedure becomes more complex. The variety of literary material — genealogy, lists and narrative — incorporated in the final form of Chronicles are, as it were, susceptible to source and redaction critical analyses.[4] The hypothesis of a larger Chronistic History incorporating Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah[5] complicates the picture even more with regard to the process of composition while at the same time narrowing the time frame for the composition of the final form.

The notion of a Chronistic History necessitates at the earliest a late fifth century date for the final form if one takes the order of Ezra and Nehemiah's missions as given, or slightly later if one doesn't.[6] If, on the other hand, one posits a long process of composition reaching back in time beyond Ezra and Nehemiah, then the Chronistic History hypothesis alone does not affect the terminus a quo.

The trend in recent research, however, is to treat Chronicles as a relatively unified and independent work. If, for the purposes

of this paper, we accept this as the starting point, then the absolute date for the final form Chronicles can be established as falling between 400 and 200 B.C.E.

Regarding the terminus a quo the following data are relevant, starting with the earliest historical reference: 2 Chr. 36:20 refers to the beginning of Persian rule and 1 Chr. 9:1 refers to the exile of Judah.[7] The list of residents of Jerusalem that follows (1 Chr. 9:2ff) parallels the list found in Neh. 11:3–19 and while a good case can be made that the Chronicler used Nehemiah as his source, there is still the possibility that both depend on an earlier common source. These two texts bring us into the post-exilic period.

1 Chr. 29:7 mentions, anachronistically, ten thousand "darics" (*'drknym*) for the service of the temple. The Persian daric was first minted by Darius I around 515 B.C.E. to which one would have to add a certain amount of time for the daric to become widely used and for the Chronicler to refer to it in an anachronistic way, which woould be the early fifth century.[8]

A less direct and hence more controversial text brings down the termius a quo even further. The genealogy of Jehoiachin (1 Chr. 3:17–24) is, unfortunately, corrupt and may refer to anywhere between seven and ten generations after Jehoiachin. If we take the minimum of seven generations after Zerubbabel and multiply by twenty years per generation, the genealogy extends to the latter half of the fifth century, or ca. 430 B.C.E.

A late fifth century date has also been supported by Polzin's study of late biblical Hebrew. He puts the language of Chronicles in the same phase of development as Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel, showing the closest affinity to the Ezra and the non-Nehemiah Memoir material.[9]

The following data are relevant for the terminus ad quem. Eupolemus, a Jewish historian of the mid-second century B.C.E. cites the LXX of Chronicles. Ben Sira's portrayal of David (Sir. 47:8–10) appears to be based on Chronicles. In particular, the reference in verse 9 to David's placing singers before the altar corresponds with the Chronicler's account of the organization of the cult (1 Chr. 15–16). This would necessitate a late third century B.C.E. date at the latest.

The two main options within this two hundred year span from 400 to 200 B.C.E. are the last century of Persian rule or the first century of Hellenistic rule. In the last few decades, only Peter

Welten has tried to make a case for a Hellenistic date on the basis of what he felt was more or less concrete evidence. He cites, for example, details in the Chronicler's building reports which, he argues, necessitate a Hellenistic date on archeological grounds.[10] Welten also argues that the organization of the military divisions into heavy and light infantry (2 Chr. 14:7 [ET v. 8]) presupposes a similar practice of the Greeks.[11] Both these arguments are unconvincing in that (1) the archeology of pre-Hasmonean Jerusalem is fairly controversial to say the least, and (2) Greek mercenaries were used by both Egyptian and Persian armies since the sixth century.

His main argument, however, concerns the reference to some sort of defensive equipment in 2 Chr. 26:15. Welten translates *ḥiššĕbōnôt* as "catapults" for shooting arrows and large stones. The catapult was invented around 400 B.C. and to Welten's mind would not have been widely known in Palestine until after Alexander's conquests.[12] This translation is, however, debatable. Yadin, for example, argues that this word refers to some sort of platform which facilitates the shooting of arrows and the dropping of large stones.[13]

Thus, it would appear that no conclusive evidence is forthcoming from Chronicles which would allow us to decide in favour of one of the two main periods. The majority of recent interpreters favour a late Persian period date on the basis of, among other things, the lack of Hellenistic influence in Chronicles. Attempts to specify the date on Chronicles any further involve reconstructing the Chronicler's purpose.

Date and Purpose

In the following I will discuss a number of examples of reconstructions of the Chronicler's purpose that have been used to postulate a specific occasion for the writing of Chronicles. I will demonstrate how these reconstructions are inadequate in substantive and conceptual terms and, as such, are irrelevant or unusable for the purpose of dating.

Since my argument centres on the very notion of "purpose" — how it has been defined, or for that matter been left undefined — I begin by examining the concept itself. The word "purpose" is used by biblical scholars to describe a number of things, from what a composition such as Chronicles is actually saying to the author's

motives for saying it. This lack of differentiation in what we mean by purpose is compounded by a lack of theoretical sophistication regarding the relationship between author, text, and context. What is needed is, in my view, a more sophisticated concept of purpose which draws from a social theoretical treatment of the problem. I take my cue from Mark Brett's discussion of the equally undifferentiated and notorious concept of "authorial intention."[14] Brett[15] suggests that we divide the notion of authorial intention into two parts: communicative intentions and motives. The communicative intentions of an author refer to the verbal meaning of the text. In order to answer the question, "What is the author trying to say?" one needs to attend to the language and genre of a text in its historical situation. Motive, obviously enough, refers to the reasons why something is said. Motives "lie behind" and are prior to communicative intentions.[16] A clear example of the distinction between communicative intentions and motives is lying. In a lie, the motive is not part of the communicatively intended verbal meaning.[17] Were we to identify the author's intended meaning with the verbal meaning alone, our understanding of what is being said and what it means would be restricted from the start. Furthermore, our assessment of the reason why the author said what he did would be limited to those motives which could be harmonized with the verbal meaning of the text. This approach would, by definition, preclude us from recognising the motive to deceive which lies behind the lie, the recognition of which is essential to our understanding the lie as such. Assessing motive requires more than an understanding of what is said; it requires a knowledge of the context of utterance or, in our case, the context of writing. When scholars speak of the Chronicler's purpose they are usually referring to a combination of all three elements: communicative intention, motive, and context of production.

Left undifferentiated, these three things tend to coalesce and are treated as aspects of the same thing. What Brett argues, following the new critics,[18] is that these are different though related things.

One can visualize this analytical point and extend it further by thinking of communicative intention, author's motives, and context of production as three intersecting circles. The areas of intersection indicate that the writing of a text involves, necessarily, an

author and a context. The areas of non-intersection indicate first of all the gap that exists between what the text actually says and the author's motives, as illustrated by the lie. There is also a gap between the author's motives and the context of the text's production. This point derives from a basic postulate of sociology which is that the individual is always acting, speaking, or writing within a particular context — linguistic, literary, cultural, historical, and institutional — which he or she did not create and cannot completely control or understand. An individual acts with certain intentions, motives, and meanings and, to a greater or lesser degree, in accordance with established conventions, but cannot control the consequences of his or her actions. Thus, the interpreter can consider each of these aspects in relative isolation or in certain combinations.

Applying this to the issue at hand, interpreters of the Chronicler's purpose have tended to link communicative intention, conscious motive, and context without considering the gap that may exist between them. They have not, by and large, considered the gap that may exist between social functions of the text in its context which, as it were, circumvent the author's motives and intentions or which pertain to what is not said as much as to what is said. Their reconstructions of the Chronicler's purpose are thus hampered from the outset by conceptual constraints.

1. Compositional Development: Freedman, Cross, and Newsome

I begin with the clearest example of a precise date being set on the basis of a particular understanding of the Chronicler's purpose. David Freedman, followed by Frank Cross and John Newsome, has sought to establish a link between the centrality of David in Chronicles and the political situation at the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua.[19] The narrative of 1 Chr. 10 ff. has two key and interrelated themes: David (and his dynasty) and the temple.

The two themes are so closely linked that the reigns of David and Solomon are dominated by the building of the temple and the establishment of its cult. In Freedman's terms, "the principle objective of the Chronicler was to write a history of the dynasty of David, not primarily in terms of its historical and political achievements... but [in terms of] its accomplishments in religious and cultic areas."[20] This interest in the Davidic dynasty

contrasts sharply with the account of Ezra's and Nehemiah's missions. The prayer of Ezra (Neh. 9:6–37) mentions the Exodus, the wilderness wanderings and the conquest but not David and his achievements.

The only plausible setting, argues Freedman, is one which combines these two interests, David and temple; in other words the time of the restoration under Zerubbabel and Jeshua (Haggai and Zechariah).

Freedman's thesis presupposes (but does not prove) that the genealogies of 1 Chr. 1–9 are secondary. Cross sought to strengthen Freedman's hypothesis in this regard via a characteristically complex reconstruction of the history of the Chronistic History. The details of his reconstruction are not of interest at this point,[21] for what interests me most is their method of interpretation. Regarding the communicative intent, neither Freedman nor Cross ask whether the text as it stands makes sense. Recent studies of the genealogies suggest that it was an integral part of the Chronicler's history,[22] and not a later addition. Nor have they taken into account the reference to darics in 1 Chr. 29:7. More important, however, is their treatment of motive. They argue that the Chronicler is trying to legitimate both the temple and the Davidic dynasty. This seems to imply that those topics which are mentioned the most are to be directly connected to particular motives. They do not ask the more fundamental question of how legitimacy is established via historical narratives in the first place.

What is the relationship between past and present as it relates to the text and to the context? If the Chronicler wanted to legitimate the second temple alone, what better way than to appeal to the golden age of its origins. If the Chronicler wanted to assert the second temple's claim to the loyalty of all Israel, what better way than to tell the story of the united monarchy as the *Urzeit* of Israel. I mention these other possibilities in order to highlight the range of considerations that have to be made in ascribing purpose.

2. The Anti-Samaritan Hypothesis: Noth and Rudolph

Charles Torrey,[23] writing at the turn of the century, was the first to argue that the Chronicler had a polemical anti-Samaritan purpose in writing. The concern for the Temple in Jerusalem is to

be understood within the context of the struggle between the Jerusalemite and Samaritan communities. Torrey's understanding of this situation derives from Josephus' account of the Samaritan priesthood, namely, that it derived from the Jerusalemite priesthood following a schism in the late fourth century B.C.E.[24]

Noth's[25] influential study of Chronicles helped to establish the anti-Samaritan hypothesis as a mainstream hypothesis in the middle of this century. Noth was confident that, quite apart from the evidence of conflict between these two communities found in Ezra-Nehemiah, the overall plan of the Chronicler's history (the fact that he begins his history with David, that fact that he emphasises the divine nature of the Davidic kingdom (2 Chr 13:4ff), and the fact that he all but ignores the history of the northern kingdom) could lead to "no other conclusion than that Chr.'s [sic] central concern was to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty and of the Jerusalem temple as Yahweh's valid cult centre."[26] "The opposition whom the Chronicler had in view can only have been the Samaritan community with a cult of their own on Mt. Gerizim."[27] The history of the North is passed over because it is an illegitimate kingdom.

The anti-Samaritan hypothesis runs into trouble on a number of levels. First, at the level of what the text actually says, it is not at all obvious that the Chronicler had no positive interest in the North. One observes, for example, that, in contrast to Samuel-Kings, the Chronicler says nothing at all about the foreign origins of the Samaritans. Quite to the contrary, the Chronicler has Hezekiah invite all Israel (and this is after the Assyrian invasion) to celebrate the Passover in Jerusalem (2 Chr 30). Second, we know very little about the early history of the Samaritan community and its cult on Mt. Gerizim. Josephus is not to be taken at face value regarding the origins of the Samaritan temple and archeological research has failed to turn up evidence of a sanctuary which might rival in any way the Temple in Jerusalem.

This leads us to the third and most significant problem with this hypothesis. Torrey and Noth's concept of purpose all has to do with the motives of the individual acting within the context of conscious political struggle. It would appear that legitimation is to be explained with reference only to competing communities and institutions and their rival claims. One wonders if

legitimation is not also an aspect of institutional structures and hierarchies within a society.

3. The Chronicler as Inclusivist: Williamson

The Chronistic History and anti-Samaritan hypotheses have suffered a reversal on a number of fronts in the last decades. Both Sara Japhet and Hugh Williamson have argued that Chronicles should be treated as a separate and substantially unified work. They argue this case on the basis of literary and linguistic evidence, but also by examining more closely the Chronicler's attitude toward the North. Taking Williamson as representative of this approach, he argues that the use of the term "Israel" in Chronicles is not exclusivist. When it is applied to Judah, as in 2 Chronicles 11:3 (all Israel in Benjamin and Judah), the Chronicler was merely leveling the score between the North and the South, for the term "all Israel" had already been applied to the Northern Kingdom in 2 Chronicles 10:16. The Chronicler wanted to show that the term "all Israel" could be used for either kingdom.[28] In extending its usage to include Judah, the Chronicler did not intend "to exclude or contrast with the Northern Kingdom, but to make a positive point that there was to be found in Judah an unbroken continuation of the Israel of earlier days."[29] Noth and others, argues Williamson, have not paid enough attention to the "all Israel" perspective which he maintains throughout the book, notwithstanding the Chronicler's condemnation of the northern kingdom.

Williamson believes that this contrasts sharply with Ezra-Nehemiah's attitude toward the residents and the North (see Ezra 4: 1–3) and that this can be explained in terms of internal division within the post-exilic community. Whereas Ezra-Nehemiah represents the viewpoint of an exclusivist group, the Chronicler represents a middle way between the exclusivists and the assimilationists as it relates to intermarriage and the Temple. According to Williamson, the Chronicler believes that "a faithful nucleus does not exclude others, but is a representative centre to which all the children of Israel may be welcomed if they will return."[30]

The Temple theme is, thus, not to be understood in terms of legitimation and polemic but rather in terms of its function as a focus of identity; it is not "a litmus test of an orthodoxy that would exclude the non-conformist but rather a focus of unity for the

people of Israel as a whole."[31]

In regard to communicative intent, Williamson has succeeded in swinging the pendulum toward a more realistic assessment of what the Chronicler was trying to say. But one wonders if he has not swung the pendulum too far in the other direction. Granted, the Chronicler does maintain an all Israel perspective, but is this interest in the identity of Israel through time not also always coupled with an internal hierarchical structure centred on Jerusalem and the Temple? Identity and legitimacy go hand in hand in the narrative and so too should our interpretation of them. How does the Chronicler identify Israel? What is Israel's story? What is its internal dynamic? What is its future? What role does the Temple have in this story? Is it crucial? Is is central?

This leads us to his treatment of the Chronicler's motives and context. Whose concept of identity is this? Who could ascribe to it? Does it serve a particular interest or stem from a particular point of view? In Williamson's interpretation, the Chronicler is an individual who is surprisingly nonpartisan in his approach and, seemingly, quite unaffected by internal political and religious conflict; he is someone who, despite his predominant interest in the validity of Jerusalem and her temple, is able to act as broker between two rival groups. The Chronicler is thought of as interacting with his social context, but still as master of his own ideas, intentions, and motives. Williamson situates the Chronicler between the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah and the much later composition of Ezra 1–6 on the basis of clear-cut and unambiguous political agendas. Ezra and Nehemiah express a moderate to strong exclusivism which the Chronicler tried to modify in the direction of a greater inclusivism. This having failed, the exclusivist tendency grew more extreme, leading to the Samaritan schism. One wonders whether or not the Chronicler's inclusivism is really all that different from the exclusivism that we find in Ezra-Nehemiah. Is not this same exclusivism maintained by the chronicler in terms of a heirarchy? The Chronicler's history is, after all, all about a contemporary institution with enormous social, economic, and political significance. We therefore have to ask about the role of the Second Temple in Judean society and in the region in general. How does the Chronicler's ideology of identity and legitimacy link up with what we know of Judean society in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E.? What were the interests of

the Temple and those in control of it? For who is both identity and legitimacy important?

It would, of course, require another paper or two to answer these questions, but my own assessment of the Chronicler's motives and the function of his history in its context can be summarised as follows. Starting with the legitimacy theme, I would argue that the Chronicler, in portraying Jerusalem as the centre of all Israel, is asking his audience to imagine Jerusalem as the centre of a nation, not just a small cultic community within an empire. Whereas the author or authors of Ezra-Nehemiah exhibit a defensive posture, the Chronicler articulates a more confident understanding of Jerusalem's role as the centre of Israel. In comparison to Ezra-Nehemiah, the Chronicler recognises an opportunity for his community to expand its horizons, to claim its rightful place over Israel.[32]

Implications for the Dating of Chronicles

The overall implication of these proposals for dating Chronicles is that the two questions, purpose and date, must be disentangled and must remain disentangled until we have reached an adequate understanding of the Chronicler's purpose. Williamson's relative chronology is as untenable as Freedman's because both of them operate with a concept of purpose that cannot deal with the complexity of the the relationship between text, author, and context. What then are the implications of my reconstruction of the Chronicler's purpose for dating?

The contrast between the Judean community before and after the terminus a quo and terminus ad quem is instructive. The post-exilic community was originally a small minority community that had to struggle to maintain its identity and secure its place in Palestine. The Jewish community of the second and first centuries B.C.E. was, by contrast, dominant in the region. Chronicles lies somewhere in the middle between these two extremes, and it is my view that the Chronicler's history anticipates, ideologically, the successes of the Maccabeans in establishing Jerusalem as a city and Temple without rival in the region. Did he write this history in the late Persian period or in the Ptolemaic period? In the context of the development of the Jewish theocratic community of the Second Temple period it may not be all that significant which of these two options is the right one.

Notes

1. Paper read at the Royal Irish Academy, 15 November 1995.
2. W. M. L. de Wette, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das alte Testament(Halle, 1806). Recently A. G. Auld has argued that both Chronicles and Samuel-Kings depend on a common *Vorlage* (*Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994) but this doesn't affect the dating question.
3. De Wette and Wellhausen stressed the Chronicler's dependence on P, whereas von Rad and Noth demonstrated dependence on D. See also J. Shaver, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work* (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990). This question also dominated Chronicles research in the 19th century; see M. P. Graham, *The Utilization of Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century*, SBLDS 116 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1990).
4. J. W. Rothstein and J. Hänel, *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, KAT (Leipzig, 1927) and A. C. Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler. Its Purpose and its Date* (London, 1939) take this too the extreme by associating various redactions with different Pentateuchal sources.
5. First proposed by L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt* (Berlin, 1832.
6. Along a similar line William Albright, following rabbinic tradition, argued that Ezra was himself the Chronicler: "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *JBL* 40 (1921): 104–24.
7. S. Japhet [*I and II Chronicles*, OTL (London: SCM, 1993), pp. 206–8] has recently defended the view that this list is intended to name residents of Jerusalem prior to exile and is, as such, a climax to the genealogies. Whilst the phrase in 9:2 translated "the first to live" is ambiguous, the notice concerning the exile in 9:1b points in the direction of those who would add "again," i.e. the returnees. Japhet, for her part, suggests that 9:1b is a gloss.
8. For a full discussion see H. G. M. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *TB* 28 (1977): 123–6.
9. R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew* (Missoula: Scholar's Press, 1976), pp. 27–84.
10. P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1973), p. 200.
11. Welten, *Geschichte*, pp. 105–11.
12. See Diodorus Siculus, XIV, 42, 1; and E. W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), pp. 48–64.
13. Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery* (London : Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963).
14. The "classic" defence of this view is E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (Yale: 1967).
15. M. G. Brett, "Four or Five Things to do with Texts," in *The Bible in Three Dimensions* (Sheffield: 1990); Brett, *Biblical Criticism in Crisis? The Impact of the Canonical Approach on Old Testament Studies* (Cambridge: 1991); Brett, "Motive and Intention in Genesis 1," *JTS* 42 (1991): 1–16; J. W. Rogerson, "The Use of Sociology in Old Testament Studies," in *Congress Volume Salamanca* (1983), VTSUP XXXVI, ed. J. A. Emerton (Leiden: 1985), pp.

245–56; Rogerson, "Anthropology and the Old Testament," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives*, ed. R. E. Clements (Cambridge: 1989), pp. 17–37.

16. Brett, "Motive and Intention," p. 5. In conjunction with this distinction, he cites Q. Skinner, "Motives, Intentions, and the Interpretation of Texts," *New Literary History 3* (1972): 393–408.
17. Brett, *Biblical Criticism*, pp. 23–6.
18. The New Critics were interested in texts as such, apart from any hypotheses about the history of the text (authorial intent or the historical context of its production). See the essay by W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, "The Intentionality Fallacy," in *20th Century Literary Criticism*, ed. D. Lodge (London: 1972), pp. 334–45 [first published in 1947].
19. D. N. Freedman, "The Purpose of Chronicles," *CBQ* 23 (1963): 436–42; F. M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *JBL* 94 (1975): 4–18; and J. Newsome, "Towards a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purpose," *JBL* 95 (1975): 201–17.
20. Freedman, "Purpose," p. 437.
21. For a lengthy critique of this position see Williamson 1977, 120–30.
22. M. Kartveit, *Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie in 1 Chronik 1–9*, (Stockholm, 1989); and M. Oeming, *Das Wahre Israel, Die "genealogische Vorhalle"* 1 Chronik 1–9, BWANT 128 (Stuttgart, 1990).
23. C. C. Torrey, "The Chronicler as Editor and Independent Narrator," in *Ezra Studies* (1910; reprinted New York: 1970), p. 209. Torrey did not treat Second Temple Judaism as a whole but as a body of competing ideologies of which Jerusalem's was only one example. See R. P. Carroll, "Torrey, C. C.," in *DBI*, pp. 696–7; idem, "Israel, History of (Post-Monarchic)," *ABD* 3: 567–76.
24. Josephus, Antiquities, bk. 11, ch. 8.
25. M. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, JSOTS p. 50, trans. H. G. M. Williamson (Sheffield: 1987), p. 100.
26. Noth's literary analysis reduced the amount of material (especially lists) devoted to the Levites [Noth, *Chronistic History*, pp. 31–42].
27. Noth, *Chronistic History*, pp. 101.
28. Williamson, *Israel*, p. 109.
29. Williamson, *Israel*, p. 107
30. Williamson, *Israel*, p. 139.
31. H. Williamson, "The Temple in the Books of Chronicles," in *Templum Amicitae* (Sheffield, 1991), p. 21. He describes the occasion of the writing of Chronicles as follows ("Temple," p. 30):

    > During the earlier reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is clear that there were at least two groups in Jerusalem. Particularly amongst the priests and aristocracy, there were those who favoured a fully open attitude to other inhabitants of the land, whether truly Israelite or not. On the other hand, the reform party took a rigourously exclusive view for ideological reasons. During the decades which followed, attitudes vacillated, but tended on the whole to polarize. The Chronicler's programme for reconciliation in the mid-fourth century BC failed, and not long after a group of assimilationists found themselves forced out. What was more natural than that they should remove to the ancient site of Shechem to establish a new community more truly representative of Israel as they saw it?

When eventually they found themselves able to build a temple, the author of Ezra 1–6 compiled his polemical response, asserting emphatically the legitimacy of the Jerusalem sanctuary alone.

Williamson has schematized the history of the period as an ever-increasing division between assimilationists and separatists. Interestingly enough, Williamson retains the notion of the Judean origins of the Samariton cult on Mt. Gezer. See Noth, *Chronistic History*, p. 104 and A. Alt, "Zur Geschichte der Grenze zwischen Judea und Samaria," in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II (München: 1953), pp. 346–62. I would turn this around and see in the history of Second Temple Judah an earlier exclusivism and a later dominating inclusivism. This dominating inclusivism was in fact realized by the Hasmoneans. In Samaria there were always those who supported Jerusalem and those who did not.

32. See J. Dyck, "The Ideology of Identity in Chronicles," *Ethnicity and the Bible*, Biblical Interpretation Series 19, ed. Mark Brett (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1996), pp. 89–116.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.